

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/667,747 | 09/22/2003 | Craig M. Carpenter | 10983.0006.00000 | 1903 | |
| 22852 FINNEGAN I | 7590 08/04/201 HENDERSON FARAE | EXAM | EXAMINER | | |
| FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413 | | | RYCKMAN, MELISSA K | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| WASHINGTON, DC 20001-1415 | | 3773 | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 08/04/2010 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|------------------|--|--|
| 10/667,747 | CARPENTER ET AL. | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| MELISSA RYCKMAN | 3773 | | |

| | MELISSA RYCKMAN | 3773 | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the | correspondence add | lress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 16 July 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI | LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL | LOWANCE. | | | | |
| M The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; or | which places the r (3) a Request | | | |
| The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | | | | |
| no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to | | | | | | |
| MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(| f). | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extended under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date | of the fee. The appropri- inally set in the final Office | ate extension fee to action; or (2) as | | | |
| NOTICE OF APPEAL | 5 Wh 07 OFD 44 07 | era di della ella di ancienti | | | | |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | | | | |
| AMENDMENTS | | | | | | |
| The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, t (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | ecause | | | |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or | | | he issues for | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | | ected claims. | | | | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1 | | | | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | | mpliant Amendment (| PTOL-324). | | | |
| Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s)would be all non-allowable claim(s). | | • | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | i be entered and an e | xpianation of | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-3,5-11 and 35-37 (see attached shee Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 14-16,18-25,27-29 | <u>II</u> . Dand 21 24 | | | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | 9 and 31-34. | | | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and | | | | | | |
| was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | - National According to the factor | data - 6.680 1- 1-6 | W 4 b - | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fail | s to provide a | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | n of the status of the claims after er | ntry is below or attach | ed. | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered but | t does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: | | | |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (13. Other: | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | | | | |
| /Melissa Ryckman/ | (Danis B. Fara) | | | | | |
| Examiner, Art Unit 3773 | /Darwin P. Erezo/ | Init 2772 | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3773

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the addition of "wherein the means for reducing air introduction includes a beveled edge at said distal end of said distal portion, said beveled edge including a tip and a base, said base disposed proximally of said tip" and the addition of claims 38-42 require further search and consideration.

Continuation of 7. NOTE: The applicant argues it would not have been obvious to modify Dormandy, Jr with Gordan, as Gordan teaches away from Dormandy. The examiner's response is Gordan teaches a catheter for delivery of an implant, and the modification of Dormandy with Gordan is obvious as the distall end of Gordan is flexible which helps the catheter pass through vesculature.